



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/664,657

09/19/2003

Yong Rui

304950.01

4632

7590

01/28/2009

Katrina A. Lyon  
LYON & HARR, LLP  
Suite 800  
300 Esplanade Drive  
Oxnard, CA 93036

EXAMINER

WORJLOH, JALATEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3685

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/28/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/664,657	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RUI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jalatee Worjloh	<b>Art Unit</b> 3685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 12, 2008 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-14 and 16-25 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Applicant argues that neither Tyree nor Mori teach "requiring a computer user to locate at least one feature of said one or more deformed body parts in the image".

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The combination of these references teaches this feature. That is, Tyree teaches an intelligence test which offers an image and prompts the user to answer a question about said image, but fails to teach body parts and location of such parts. Mori teaches an algorithm for locating key points within an undistorted image of a body. Thus, it would have been obvious to modify the system/method of Tyree to include the body parts of Mori. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

Art Unit: 3685

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

5. Applicant argues that neither Tyree nor Mori teach “comparing the computer user’s locations of at least one feature of said one or more body parts in the image and determining whether the computer user is a human or a computer program using the comparison of the computer user's location of said at least one feature to the known location.”

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tyree discloses comparing stored answer (see paragraph [0103]) and determining whether the computer user is a human or computer program (see paragraphs [0042], [0072], and [0074]). Mori discloses the features of the known locations in the image. Thus, it would have been obvious to apply the concepts taught by Tyree to features of the known locations in the image of Mori.

6. Applicant argues that Mori does not suggest locating key points in a distorted body part.

However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Figure 5 of Tyree is an illustration of an intelligence test that can be presented to a user. In Tyree, a distorted image is generated and is presented with a distorted image (see Fig. 5, 502 & paragraph [103] – the graphical image can be generated so as not to be easily recognized using image recognition technology). A challenge prompting and querying the user to input is provided, which is a requirement. The inputted information is compared and it is determined whether or not the user is a human or computer program. Mori discloses an algorithm for locating key points within an image of a body (see

Art Unit: 3685

page 1). It would be obvious at the time the invention was made to substitute the body image of Mori with a distorted image because the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-9, 10-14, 16-22, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claims 1 and 6 recite “a computer-implemented process for determining whether a computer user is a human or a computer program, comprising the process actions of:...”; however, it is unclear where the computer implementation takes place. Thus, in order to overcome this rejection, please include structure (e.g. computer, machine, device) within the claim’s body.

10. The term "certain" in claims 1 and 10 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "certain" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicants amended the claim to recite “certain features of the deformed body parts”, but fail to identify the features. What are the certain features?

Art Unit: 3685

11. Claims 1 and 10 recites “certain features of the deformed body parts are at known locations of said images”, but does not previously identify the “known locations”. What are the known locations?

12. Claims 1 and 6 recite “requiring a computer user to locate at least one feature of said one or more deformed body parts in the image”; however, it is unclear how this step is implemented. How is the process requiring the user to locate the feature? Is there a prompt at the user computer?

13. Claims 1, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The claim recites determining whether the computer user is a human or a computer program using the comparison of the computer user’s location of said at least one feature to the known locations. Once, the determination is made, what happens next? Is there an output to the user’s computer?

14. The term "certain" in claim 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "certain" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicants amended the claim to recite “certain features of the deformed body parts”, but fail to identify the features. What are the certain features?

15. Claim 6 recites “certain features thereof are at known locations”, but does not previously identify the “known locations”. What are the known locations?

16. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the computer-user-identified feature locations" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 3685

17. Claim 9 is considered a hybrid claim. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II.

In particular, the claims are directed to neither a "process" or a "machine" but rather embrace or overlap two different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §101.. For example, claim 9 recites " A computer-implemented process." In light of this evidence, one of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a process claim. Alternatively, claim 9 also recites " wherein the computer pointing device is one of:" One of ordinary skill in the art could also reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a product claim. In light of this conflicting evidence, a person of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret claim 9 to be drawn to both a product or process.

Therefore in accordance with §2173.05(p) II which states that a single claim must be drawn to either a product or process (but not both) and because a potential competitor of Applicant(s) would not know whether *possession alone* of the claimed structure constituted infringement, or alternatively, if infringement required the *execution* of the recited method steps, the claims are indefinite. If Applicant(s) overcome this particular 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection, the related 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection will also be withdrawn. For examination purposes, the Examiner will interpret claim 9 as claims directed to a process only.

18. Claims 10-14, and 16-22 are considered a hybrid claim. See MPEP §2173.05(p) II.

In particular, the claims are directed to neither a "process" or a "machine" but rather embrace or overlap two different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 U.S.C. §101.. For example, claim 10 recites " A system." In light of this evidence, one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3685

art could reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a product claim. Alternatively, claim 10 also recites " a computer program comprising program modules.." One of ordinary skill in the art could also reasonably interpret these recitations as express intent by Applicant(s) to claim a process claim. In light of this conflicting evidence, a person of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret claim 10 to be drawn to both a product or process.

Therefore in accordance with §2173.05(p) II which states that a single claim must be drawn to either a product or process (but not both) and because a potential competitor of Applicant(s) would not know whether *possession alone* of the claimed structure constituted infringement, or alternatively, if infringement required the *execution* of the recited method steps, the claims are indefinite. If Applicant(s) overcome this particular 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection, the related 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection will also be withdrawn. For examination purposes, the Examiner will interpret claim 9 as claims directed to a process only.

19. Claim 10 recite "require a computer user to locate at least one feature of said one or more deformed body parts in the image"; however, it is unclear how this step is implemented. How is the process requiring the user to locate the feature? Is there a prompt at the user computer?

20. The term "certain" in claims 24 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "certain" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. What are the certain features?



Art Unit: 3685

21. Claims 24 recites "certain features of the deformed body parts are at known locations of said images", but does not previously identify the "known locations". What are the known locations?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

22. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

23. Claims 9, 10-14, and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

35 USC 101 requires that in order to be patentable the invention must be a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, *or* composition of matter, *or* any new and useful improvement thereof" (emphasis added). The applicants claims mentioned above are intended to embrace or overlap *two* different statutory classes of invention as set forth in 35 USC 101. The claims begin by discussing a system, but subsequently the claims then deal with the specifics of a method (the steps) executed by the processing means (see above rejection of claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for specific details regarding this issue). "A claim of this type is precluded by the express language of 35 USC 101 which is drafted so as to set forth the statutory classes of invention in the alternative only", Ex parte Lyell (17 USPQ2d 1548).

24. Claims 23- 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 23 recites "a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for creating a test to determine whether a use is a person or a

Art Unit: 3685

bot, said computer executable instructions comprising:”; however, the computer does not actually executes the instruction.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 13, 17-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tyree US PG PUB 2002/0120853 (hereinafter referred to as Tyree) in view of Greg Mori et al. "Estimating Human Body Configurations using Shape Context Matching" from the 2001 IEEE Computing Society's Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (hereinafter referred to as Mori).

Claim 1 of the application recites:

A computer-implemented process for determining whether a computer user is a human or a computer program, comprising the process actions of:

Art Unit: 3685

generating a human interactive proof ( [0034], [0039], [0072], [0103]) employing an image ([0029], [0102], [0103]) of one or more body parts wherein certain features thereof are at known locations in said image;

requiring a computer user to locate ([0029]) at least one feature of said one or more body parts in the image;

comparing the computer user's locations of said at least one feature of said one or more body parts to their actual location in the image; and

determining whether the computer user is a human or a computer program ([0042], [0072], and [0074]) using the comparison of the computer user's location of said at least one feature to the known location.

Tyree discloses the exemplary embodiment of an intelligence test which offers an image and prompts the user to answer a question about said image ([0102]), which is then compared with the stored answer ([0103]). It does not however discuss an image which contains body parts, and location of such parts. Also, Tyree does not expressly disclose using the comparison of the user's location of said at least one feature to the known location. However, the security of any human interactive proof is contingent upon the ability of the algorithm to correctly identify elements within the produced tests for comparison with user input. The Mori paper discloses an algorithm for locating key points within an undistorted image of a body (paragraph 1, pg 1). The basic image then would be understandable to the program prior to its distortion. After

Art Unit: 3685

transformations (which are known to the program) are applied, the resultant image would not be identifiable by body/facial recognition software of the time. As for feature where the body parts are deformed, Tyree generating and presenting distorted graphical images (see paragraph [0103]). It would be obvious at the time the invention was made to substitute the body image of Mori with a distorted image because the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the two in order to increase the level of security offered by the "test", thus improving the marketability of the software product as a whole.

Referring to claim 2, Mori discloses wherein said deformed body parts is a human face see section 5, pg 5 and claim 1 above).

Claim 3 of the application recites:

The computer-implemented process of Claim 1 wherein said one or more deformed body parts is an entire human body.

The additional limitation of a human body is taught by Mori (section 1, paragraph 1, pg 1 and claim 1 above).

Claim 4 of the application recites:

Art Unit: 3685

The computer-implemented process of Claim 1 wherein said one or more deformed body parts is an animal.

The additional limitation of an animal is disclosed by Mori (section 1, paragraph1, pg 1; claim 1 above).

Claim 7 of the application recites:

The computer-implemented process of Claim 1 wherein the process action for determining whether the computer user is a human or a computer program comprises using a comparison of the computer user's locations of said at least one feature of said one or more body parts to the location of said features in the image.

Tyree teaches a system which includes a comparator for comparing the expected answer of a given "test" with the answer provided by the user (claim 18). Utilizing the images of body parts disclosed earlier by Mori, the challenge put forth by the validating program ([0102]) could reasonably consist of identifying and locating parts of the image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Tyree with the recognition system of Mori, to improve the marketability of the software product by providing a slightly different form of test challenge.

Claim 8 of the application recites:

Art Unit: 3685

The computer-implemented process of Claim 1 wherein the computer-user-identified feature locations are specified by the user, using a computer pointing device.

The limitation of identifying locations in an image using an input device is met by Tyree who discloses querying a user for user input regarding the challenge, within an input field, which can reasonably be construed as the clickable region of an image map. Furthermore Tyree describes computer having input devices which include a mouse or other pointing device ([0096]), thus meeting the additional limitation of a computer pointing device. Mori's algorithm discloses automated feature location (section 1, paragraph 1, pg 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two to improve efficiency of the human interactive proof by allowing a user to click on features rather than typing them out.

Claim 9 of the application recites;

The computer-implemented process of Claim 8 wherein the computer

Pointing device is one of:

a mouse; and

a digital pen.

The limitation of a pointing device is taught by Tyree's disclosure of computer input devices ([0096]).

Art Unit: 3685

Claim 10 of the application recites:

A system for creating a Human Interactive Proof using an image of a face,

the system comprising:

a general purpose computing device ([0092] – [0095]); and

a computer program comprising program modules executable by the computing

device, wherein the computing device is directed by the program modules of the

computer program ([0098] – [0099]) to,

generate a human interactive proof employing an image ([0029], [0034], [0072], and

[0103]) of a deformed human face wherein certain features are at known locations in said

image;

require a computer user to locate ([0029]) certain features of said deformed face in the

image;

compare the computer user's locations of said features of said deformed face to their

actual location in the image; and

determine whether the computer user is a human or a bot ([0042], [0072], and [0074]).

Tyree discloses an intelligence test which offers an image to a potential user and prompts the user to answer a question about said image ([0102]), which is then compared with the stored answer ([0103]). It does not disclose an image which contains a human face, and location of

Art Unit: 3685

facial features. Mori paper discloses an algorithm for locating key points within an undistorted image of a body (paragraph 1, pg 1), which can be applied to facial recognition (item 1, section 5, pg 5). The basic image then would be understandable to the program prior to its distortion. After transformations (which are known to the program) are applied, the resultant image would not be identifiable by body/facial recognition software of the time. As for feature where the body parts are deformed, Tyree generating and presenting distorted graphical images (see paragraph [0103]). It would be obvious at the time the invention was made to substitute the body image of Mori with a distorted image because the simple substitution of one known element for another producing a predictable result renders the claim obvious. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the two in order to increase the level of security offered by the "test", thus improving the marketability of the software product as a whole.

As for the step, wherein the module for generating a human interactive proof comprises *sub-modules for* inputting a first texture map, Tm and a generaic model of a face....", Claim 10 recites "the module for generating a human interactive proof comprises sub-modules for:". Applicant is reminded that functional recitation(s) using the word "for" have been considered but are given little patentable weight<sup>1</sup> because they fail to add any structural limitations and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed product must result in a structural difference between the claimed product and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it reads on the claimed limitation. *In re Casey*, 370

---

<sup>1</sup> See *e.g. In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that



Art Unit: 3685

F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) (“The manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself.”); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See also MPEP §§ 2114 and 2115. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the claim interpretation principles in this paragraph apply to all examined claims currently pending.

Claim 11 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the image is automatically synthesized.

Tyree does not explicitly disclose automated image synthesis it does discuss a random test generator that determines an expected answer ([0039]). The Mori paper teaches an algorithm for automatically determining features on an image of a human body. It is necessary for the test generator of Tyree to have the capability of determining the answer to the test, in this case the location of body parts within the image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the test generator of Tyree with the automated process of Mori in order to improve efficiency.

Claim 13 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the module to determine whether a computer user is a human or a bot determines that the computer user is a human if the

---

although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight).

Art Unit: 3685

computer user's locations of said features are within a given distance from their actual location.

The only additional limitation claim 13 adds to claim 10 is that of the locations of features, which are input by the user, as being within a given distance from their actual location. With regards to a comparison of feature location, there are three possible outcomes for a user's estimated location: it is either within a given distance, outside a given distance, or at the origin/at the actual location. Since a comparison of the estimated features is being made to their actual location already it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to conduct that comparison based on the estimate being within a given distance.

Although the conditional elements have been considered, Applicant is reminded that optional or conditional elements do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted. See MPEP §2106 II. C: "Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]"

Claim 17 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the determination of whether the user is a human or a computer program is made without human intervention.

Art Unit: 3685

The limitation of lack of human intervention is taught by Tyree as a comparator component of the system ([0039]).

Claim 18 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the user points to the feature points with a computer input device.

Additionally Claim 19 recites:

The system of Claim 18 wherein the computer input device is a mouse.

The Tyree publication discloses the limitation of identifying locations in an image using an input device by querying a user for input regarding the challenge, within an input field, which can reasonably be construed as the clickable region of an image map.

Claim 21 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the image size is 512 x 512 pixels.

The examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of image manipulation at the time of the invention to generate, crop, resize, or otherwise manipulate the image of claim 10 to the size of 512 x 512 pixels.

Claim 22 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the image in the human interactive proof is test image IF with ground truth of face locations and facial feature locations.

The scope of this claim is covered under claim 10's disclosure of generating an HIP employing the image of a human face and having known locations of features within the image. These feature locations are used by the system for comparison ([0034]), to determine authentication and thus it is inherent that ground truth should be represented by these locations. This claim encompasses no additional matter and is therefore rejected under the same premise as claim 10.

27. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tyree in view of Mori and further in view of Luis von Ahn, et al "CAPTCHA: Using Hard AI Problems For Security" (hereinafter referred to as von Ahn), presented at the EuroCrypt 2003 conference in Warsaw Poland.

Claim 5 of the application recites:

The computer-implemented process of Claim 1 wherein said determination of whether a computer user is a human or a computer program is used for one of:

Art Unit: 3685

assigning an email account;  
validating an input in a poll;  
using a search engine;  
using a chat room; and  
accessing data on a website. ([0036])

Tyree teaches the concept of using a human interactive proof to control access to network resources and storage ([0036]). The von Ahn paper goes further to describe the use of HIP for Online polls (pg 1, section 1, paragraph 2), Email account services (section 1, paragraph 1, pg 2), and Search Engines (section 1, paragraph 2, pg 2). All of these are examples of network resources and storage facilities. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the HIP for controlling access to many types of internet accessible resources to expand the usefulness of the proof generating software and thus improve its overall marketability

28. Claims 12, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tyree in view of Mortlock et al, US Patent 6,549,200 (hereinafter referred to as Mortlock).

Claim 12 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the image is a distorted face embedded  
in a cluttered background

Art Unit: 3685

The applicant discloses that it is known in the art to put an image of a distorted word on a cluttered background image ([0006]). The applicant does not disclose the image of a face on a cluttered background. The Mortlock patent discloses the ability to create an image of a human head/face. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the applicant's disclosed image, with that of Mortlock's facial image in order to expand the variety of images that can be used in an HIP system. Increasing the variety of usable images will increase security offered by the system and therefore its marketability.

Claim 16 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the image is generated to include at least

one of:

non-frontal faces;

faces that is non-symmetrical;

various lighting and shading conditions; and

a background that contains face-like clutter.

It has been established with regards to the previous claim that putting text on a distorted text ([006]), and that it would have been obvious to combine this with the facial image creation of Mortlock. Mortlock discloses the limitations of on-frontal faces (fig 4Fig 3A, Fig 13), and pictures with varied lighting effects (column 13, lines 32-34). It would have additionally been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to one of ordinary skill in the art of graphic design, to

Art Unit: 3685

manipulate the facial images of Mortlock to make them non-symmetrical. Including these features in the HIP would improve its ability to deter non-human users and thus improve its offers, and make it more marketable.

Claim 20 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the inputs to generate the image are a 3D wire model of a generic head and a cylindrical texture map  $T_m$  of an arbitrary person.

Tyree discloses a computer means for creating human interactive proof images ([0029], [0034], [0072], and [0103]). It does not discuss the manner in which these images are created. The creation of 3-d images utilizing wire models was well known in the art of graphics creation at the time of invention and the creation of such images is discussed by Mortlock. Mortlock discloses a wire frame which is covered in a texture map (fig 3A, column 1, lines 23-25, column 2, and lines 17-52) used to create an image of a human head/face. This texture map can be cylindrical (column 20, lines 11-14) among other shapes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the HIP system of Tyree with the 3-D graphics creation technique of Mortlock in order to improve the security and therefore the functionality of the system, by using non-textual images which would make it difficult for automated scripts which are used to attempting to decode the textual image.

Art Unit: 3685

29. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tyree in view of Mortlock and further in view of Mori.

Claim 14 of the application recites:

The system of Claim 10 wherein the features of the face comprise the four corners of the eyes and the two corners of the mouth.

Mortlock discusses a method for creating an image of a human head/face from a wire model and a texture map (Fig 3A, column 1, lines 18-21) as well as the known points of eyes, ears, chin, etc (column 14, table 1). Regarding the limitation of the facial feature of the four corners of the eyes, Mortlock shows texture maps of the two eyes, trimmed at the inner and outer corners. In order for such trimming to occur from a larger photograph input, it is inherent that the system of Mortlock have the ability to discern the position of the four corners of the subject's eyes (Fig 3A #27). Though the chin and larynx are disclosed as known locations, the two corners of the mouth are not. The Mori, paper discloses an algorithm for locating key points on a human body (abstract, page 5 section 5, item 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the HIP system of Tyree with the facial image of Mortlock, and the feature recognition of Mori, in order to create an HIP that offers a wide range of potential answer choices, improving its security and thus its functionality.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

30. Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.



Art Unit: 3685

31. Claims 23-25 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101 set forth in this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is 571-272-6714. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Calvin Hewitt II can be reached on 571-272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300 for regular communications and 571-273-6714 for Non-Official /Draft.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jalatee Worjloh/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3685